

\$~67

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of decision: 20th March, 2019

+ W.P.(C) 2824/2019

SELF-FINANCING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajiv Bansal, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Sameer Rohatgi, Mr. Namit
Suri, Mr. Kunal Kumar,
Mr. Dipender Chauhan,
Mr. Akhil Pradhan and
Mr. Rahul Worah, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, ASC-
GNCTD/R-1
Ms. Anita Sahani, Adv. for R-
2/GGSIPU

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

ORDER (ORAL)

20.03.2019

%

1. Mr. Rajiv Bansal, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner draws my attention to para 7 of the order, dated 4th November, 2015, passed by a learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.(C) 10334/2015 (*Vivekanand Institute of Professional Studies v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Anr.*) which reads thus :

“7. Having perused the record, I am of the view that the respondents can be directed to take a decision in the matter. Accordingly, the respondents are directed to take a decision in terms of the 2007 Act as to whether or not they propose to accept the recommendations. The decision, in this behalf, will be taken (if not already taken), as expeditiously as possible though, not later than two months from today. Needless to say, if the recommendations are accepted, they will be duly notified.”

2. The above directions, Mr. Bansal points out, were issued in the context of the recommendation of the earlier State Fee Regulatory Committee. In this case, the recommendations of the State Fee Regulatory Committee were received in two tranches, on 5th and 7th December, 2018. Mr. Bansal only prays for a direction, in terms of the afore-extracted para 7 of the order of this Court in W.P.(C) 10334/2015.

3. Mr. Aggarwal submits that the respondent is seized of the matter and would take an appropriate view thereon.

4. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction, to Respondent No.1, to take a decision regarding the recommendations, dated 5th and 7th December, 2018 of the State Fee Regulatory Committee and in case, they are accepted, to duly notify the same. The decision on the recommendations would be taken within a period of two months from today.

5. Ms. Anita Sahani appearing for Respondent No.2 submits that no relief has been sought against her client and that, therefore, she has nothing to submit in the matter.

Dasti.

MARCH 20, 2019/kr

C. HARI SHANKAR, J



नित्यमेव जयते